

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 93 11:36:02 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #20
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 5 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 20

Today's Topics:

1200Mhz is not a microwave band!
Ham transmissions-a hypothetical situation
ICOM W2A Battery rails
License time 10/18->1/4
Manufactures service.
Need to measure PEP
Palomar TX-5200 linear.
RTTY contest software
TS-520 Mod for 30M?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 16:09:41 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9301041945.aa10639@ingate.microsoft.COM> a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

>As I say above: 900 and 1200Mhz are not microwave bands. They are UHF bands.

Most equipment manufacturers disagree with you. Motorola has marketed
a "microwave" radio system in the 950 MHz spectrum for many years. I
have six of them and they all say "microwave" on the cabinets. Microwave
ovens also operate below 3 GHz, as do all of our broadcast ENG microwave
links in the 2 GHz area.

The ITT's Reference Data For Radio Engineers has this to say about the spectrum from 300-3,000 MHz: "Description of bands by means of adjectives is arbitrary and the CCIR recommends that it be discontinued, e.g., "ultra high frequency" should not be used to describe the range 300 to 3000 MHz." Thus the terms UHF and microwave are both *slang* terms that are not acceptable to the CCIR, though they are in common use by users and manufacturers alike. Most manufacturers and users consider frequencies above 900-1000 MHz to be "microwave" bands. Since slang is defined by usage, then this spectrum is de facto microwave.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 16:17:35 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Ham transmissions-a hypothetical situation
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan5.085312.22208@ringer.cs.utsa.edu> sbooth@lonestar.utsa.edu (Simon E. Booth) writes:

>
>Here's a hypothetical situation I've been wondering about:
>
>Say I'm a ham operator (hopefully in the next few months!) and I have a
>favorite frequency (not claiming it of course) that I like to conduct
>QSO's on. My friends have shortwave receivers and I tell them to tune
>to that frequency if they want to hear me on the radio.
>
>My transmissions are not meant to be one way, for them, so does this
>violate the no one-way broadcasting rule?
>
>I'm conducting normal QSO's in this situation, not acknowledging that
>my friends are listening (saying hello to them, etc.).
>
>Is this legal??

Yes. Tipping your SWL friends off to frequencies you will be likely to use is not a problem as long as you aren't intending to do one way transmissions directed at them.

>Which takes me to another more unusual question:

>Have amateur operators ever receiver reception reports from regular
>shortwave listeners?

Sure. It's less common today than when we were operating AM, but it still happens from time to time. Most hams who QSL, not all do, will reply to a SWL card.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 18:28:16 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!bparrish@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ICOM W2A Battery rails
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I had one of the rails on my ICOM W2A battery break about a month ago (radio is about a year old). Could someone pass me along the information about ICOM's fix for this (was it a fix to the RADIO, or to the BATTERY, and were they extending warranty on it?) It was one of the rails on the BATTERY that broke, but the ones on the radio look about as susceptible as those on the battery. So far, I've put it back together with cyanoacrilate, and it holds together for a while... I guess I need to get a new battery eventually anyway, but I'm curious what ICOM was doing about the problem... I only have vague recollection that there was a fix.

Thanks,

Bill Parrish (bparrish@hprfes.rose.hp.com)
KM6KV

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 18:32:49 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!uxa.cso.uiuc.edu!
aaa33750@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: License time 10/18->1/4
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

A local testing session on Oct. 18 turned up licenses on Jan. 4.
Just thought I'd throw another number out after seeing a few posts saying anything from 8 to 12+ weeks. Note that this was both

new licenses (including a 1 day extra) as well as upgrades (such as myself).

73 es have patience!

Drew kb9fko

arnett@uiuc.edu

Date: 5 Jan 93 16:41:37 GMT

From: news.tek.com!shaman!pogo!tcmaint@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Manufactures service.

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Netters,

In the past people have made verious comments on Icom, Kenwood, and other manufacturer's service of their equipment. No one had much experience with Yaesu so I thought I would let you know my latest experience with them.

I have an FT-980 HF transceiver. It has a really weird heat sensitive tuning problem on the VFO board that causes the tuning to start acting like the rig has channels instead of a continuous tuning capability. When this happens the rig will tune in a few stations but most are either too low or too high in frequency. As I try to tune them in the radio display shows a normal continuous readout but the radio appears to jump frequency. Weird, huh. Probably a tuning varactor or crystal. Anyway...

On or about November 23 I sent the rig to Yaesu service center in Cerritos, Calif. Approximately Dec.8 I called Yaesu to find out what was what and they told me the rig had arrived but no technician had been assigned yet. Dec.16 approx. I called again and it had been given to a technician but 'wait a couple of days so the technician can identify the problem and give you an accurate quote'. No problem. Just seems to be taking a long time.

About Dec.21 Yaesu called and give me a quote of \$283. I said that was too much and send the rig back too me and I would fix it myself. I then talked to the parts department and ordered the parts quoted to me at \$71.83. The parts arrived with a price of \$31.83, not \$71.83 as quoted in the bill. The next day I got a letter from Yaesu quoting \$200.83 for the price(\$71.83 parts) of repair. Did I misunderstand them? I don't know for sure but it seems to me they repeatedly said \$283 over the phone when I talked to them. Oh well, when the rig gets here I will fix it anyway although I probably would have gone for the two hundred dollar price.

Waiting for the rig to arrive. On Dec. 29 or 30 I called to see if the rig had been sent. Oh no here it is on my shelf waiting for me to make out the paper work!!!!!!! What, I told you on the 21st to send the rig back. Oh, yes but.... Will you send the rig back to me now. Yes, right away. COD? Yes. OK, now give me your supervisor. He is busy on the phone right now. Here is my number, have him call me. Two hours later I left the house since I wasn't going to wait on them. Never heard a word from them.

It is now January 5, 1993 and I am still waiting on Yaesu to get my rig back too me. You gather your own conclusion. Sent in on November 23. Not back yet on January 5.

Oh, by the way. Judging from the two ICs, one varactor, one variable capacitor, one crystal and one relay I would say the technician didn't really know what part was bad and planned to shot gun the problem. Not completely without justification judging by the problem. When I work on it I figure starting with the two ICs and the varactor. I'll go from their although I probably will use my heat gun and cold spreay with a straw to isolate it better.

I really hate to give up on Yaesu because I have allways liked their tranceivers. Better than Kenwood or Icom but it is only an ergonomic personal thing with me. I allways found them more logical for my operation. SSB for what it is worth. And their receivers were allways hot. But now I will be looking at the other manufacturers more seriously.

Terry Burge,
KI7M

Date: 5 Jan 93 17:55:37 GMT
From: pipex!bnr.co.uk!uknet!uos-ee!ees1mw@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Need to measure PEP
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I need a simple circuit that will enable me to convert an average reading type wattmeter to measure PEP. Some form of sample&hold or peak detector. This will allow me to know how much pep I am producing without needing to whistle into the microphone on SSB, much better for the o/p valve.

I tried using a dual op-amp but it has too much i/p bias, I know I could use a better amp but that only reduces the problem. The output from the diode detector is only a few 10s of mV. Actually 20W is 300mV, 200W 3V etc (square law). I want to measure 2W to 500W or 30mV to 7.5V pep, in several ranges. The problem arises at 30mV.
A standard diode in feedback loop plus capacitor on inverting input to ground op-amp circuit suffers at low input levels where input offset currents of a few nA are significant.

Hope somone has solved this before and can help.

73 Mike

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 16:21:44 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Palomar TX-5200 linear.

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <ReDuwB1w164w@fatcity.cts.com> don@fatcity.cts.com (Don Hamiel) writes:
>I recently bought the amp listed above at a swap meet. I have no info on it
>and Palomer is out of business. I would like to know if anyone is familiar
>with it and can tell me some specs. Things like, power output, what kind of
>transistors did it have? There were no transistors in it and it takes 4. I
>was told that to put higher pwr devices (MRF-421 @ 100 watts each) would
>require some ckt changes. Any help on this subject, any help would be
>appreciated. Thank You de Don N6NLX./s

What? Palomar out of business? They have three ads in the current QST.
Try calling them at (619) 747-3343. I know they don't make HF amps
anymore since the FCC laid Type Acceptance on them, but they can probably
still supply a manual for their *CB* footwarmers.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 17:08:32 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!do-not-reply-to-
path@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: RTTY contest software
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know of a decent contest RTTY program available on
a FTP site?

I used Lan-Link in the last contest, it somehow lost my first days
entries, while I was in the software it worked great. Whenk I
exited and used it the next day, the log existed but contained
no entries. Now I do know something about computers, I am manager
of computer support for a University. The size of the file
indicates it was empty .. Could have sworn it was writing the
entries to disk. the only thing I can think of is that it was
keeping the entries in RAM.. doesn't seem likely. I went back
and repeated what I had done and it worked fine. Checked the
whole disk and couldn't find a file that could have been out
there being written to., If anyone is very familiar with the
program, maybe you can offer some advice. I liked using the proogram
but gave up on the contest because of what happened.

73s de Cookeville, TN

Jeff, AC4HF

--

Jeff M. Gold, AC4HF

Manager, Academic Computing Support

Tennessee Technological University

Date: Tue, 05 Jan 93 18:46:16 GMT

From: usc!sdd.hp.com!caen!uvaarpa!vdoe386!ragee@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: TS-520 Mod for 30M?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does any one know of an article or have some experiece you
would share for converting the 40M band on a Kenwood 520 to 30M?

Any referrals would be greatly appreciated!

=====
Randy T. Agee - WB4BZX

Virginia Department of Education

Richmond, VA

ragee@vdoe386.vak12ed.edu

Date: 5 Jan 1993 17:23:51 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>, <8309@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan5.151546.17029@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan5.151546.17029@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>In article <8309@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>>Fortunately for reason, the FCC disagrees. I suggest you reread 97.205(e).

>What does limiting user control of ancillary functions have to do with

>anything in this discussion?

I guess, then, that you support limiting the right to keep and bear arms to
members of an organized militia unit...

(If you answered this point before, I missed it.)

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of all Fears_

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 15:43:39 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!

gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<1993Jan04.041155.17364@ssc.com>, <2991@eram.esi.COM.AU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Wilful interference (was Re: 430mhz band under th)

In article <2991@eram.esi.COM.AU> dave@eram.esi.COM.AU (Dave Horsfall) writes:

>In article <1993Jan04.041155.17364@ssc.com>,

> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>| In article <1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>| >Suppose hams A & B start a QSO on the output of repeater C. If repeater

>| >C subsequently starts to operate and interferes with the QSO, which is

>| >NOT USING THE REPEATER ITSELF, then it is the repeater (or its users)

>| >that are guilty of interference.

>|

>| Nope! This tactic was tried in LA by jammers in the 1970s...and

>| it didn't work. They figured they had found a loophole....since the

>| repeater was not transmitting on top of THEM. No one was amused!

>

>Agreed! It's the same in Australia: repeater frequencies are well-known

>(they are published, and all are OPEN; also individuals cannot set up

>a repeater; only clubs etc can) so if some twits come up on a repeater

>output (deliberately or otherwise) it's their problem if the repeater

>clobbers them... Basically, a repeater is not required to listen to its

>own output before transmitting (unlike Amateur stations).

The difference is that in the US repeaters *are* Amateur stations just like anyone else. They have the same requirement not to transmit deliberately over another legal transmission as any other Amateur station. It's often difficult to do this in practice because the control operator rarely has as good an antenna site as the repeater. Most amateurs operating on the output frequency of an idle repeater just accept the interference when someone kerchunks the repeater because there's little that can be done about it. Ideally, repeaters would have output channel receivers and

refrain from transmitting when the frequency is in use, but in practice few actually have this capability. Some that are really glorified remote bases *do* have this capability, but it's rarely wired into the controller logic for automatic control.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 22:49:56 GMT
From: nwnexus!jhgrud!eskimo!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1i0dkmINNk2s@network.ucsd.edu>, <1i22svINNdm6@hp-col.col.hp.com>,
<1i3an0INN2iv@network.ucsd.edu>
Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)

In article <1i3an0INN2iv@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:
>SoCal has long had a "test pair" - you have to get your machine working
>on the test pair before you can get a full-on coordination. Last time
>I keyed up on the test pair in Los Angeles, I brought up five machines
>simultaneously. Lord only knows how many other repeaters there were on
>the channel that DIDN'T run the same PL as I was using!
>
>I've only keyed up one system on the test pair here in San Diego this
>evening. It seems to be carrier squelch. There might be others with
>different PLs.
> - Brian

Western Washington has long had a test pair on 2 meters for "garage repeaters." The coordinators ask that everyone run low power at low elevation and use PL.

A few years ago a guy moved to the area and brought his 2 mtr machine with him. He promptly put it on a hilltop running high power on the "test pair", and pretty much told everyone to shove it!

It didn't last long....he and the repeater are gone.

--

Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544

Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 15:48:16 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!
gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2984@eram.esi.COM.AU>, <Tk1uwB2w164w@pillock.moron.vware.mn.org>,
<2993@eram.esi.COM.AU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Converting 49Mhz Toys to 6 meters

In article <2993@eram.esi.COM.AU> dave@eram.esi.COM.AU (Dave Horsfall) writes:
>
>Perhaps, but that does not detract from the popular view that Tandy (Aus)
>sell over-priced junk... I am always amused at their resistors, packed
>in individual blister packs, for about 20 cents each...
>
>Evidently the Tandy in Australia is nothing like the Radio Shack in USA.

Rat Shack sells the blister packed resistors here too. They may be
over-priced for a company purchasing department who needs thousands
of resistors, but for the ham who needs *one* to repair a radio on a
Sunday afternoon, they aren't over-priced. With most of the large
wholesalers requiring a \$25 minimum and a company purchase order,
those 20 cent Rat Shack resistors begin to look awfully cheap.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 93 17:13:47 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <8319@lib.tmc.edu>, <1ialnnINNt37@transfer.stratus.com>,
<8323@lib.tmc.edu>0
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8323@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <1ialnnINNt37@transfer.stratus.com> leadfoot@bigbootay.sw.stratus.com (Mark Curtis) writes:

>>|> Second, the lane Jim's Porsche is in

>>|> is one of the most heavily traveled lanes on the highway.

>>All the more reason not to park your car in the lane blocking it. I don't
>>care how many lanes there are, when they're all needed people have to
>>share. When there are unused lanes available then it isn't a problem,
>>but when demand is high the rules have to change. No more private use
>>of public property.

>

>Sorry, but this doesn't wash either. You're demanding that Jim change his
>Porsche into a public bus, just liek all the public busses in all the other
>lanes. Are you going to pay for it? If not, then what gives you the right to
>take his property?

The analogy of a private vehicle compared to a private repeater is totally flawed. No one is suggesting that anyone MUST turn over their private property to anyone else. A better example is that you have your own radio controlled private vehicle but there are no or minimal constraints to prohibit others from making the vehicle operate. If someone other than the anointed few that you want to allow to use/operate the radio controlled vehicle do so, your only recourse is to turn it off or change the control authorization process. Use of any repeater does not constitute a taking of any kind. Sure you make the relays kerchunk and the circuits operate but the "owner" of that repeater is the responsible party to ensure an access arrangement that is private enough to eliminate those that s/he doesn't want to operate the private repeater.

>example, are extremely confusing to the uninitiated, as well as being
>expensive to set up and maintain. Others have sophisticated control systems
>driving all manner of accessories; a careless touch tone at the wrong time
>can bring the whole thing crashing down on your head. You would have all such
>repeaters open to every ham.

As others have pointed out, this is really poor engineering if any system (repeater, computer, etc.) is that easily brought down by someone just "playing" with different codes. If a user needs to be that sophisticated then the access process must be that much more secure to eliminate all probability of a casual user inadvertently or deliberately gaining access and "crashing down" the system.

> The net effect of _that_ would be lowering all
>repeaters to the lowest kerchunk-box common denominator. What ever happened to
>experimentation?

Experimentation is and should be encouraged, but as with all experimentation

there is also the risk of the unknown. Learning that someone punching up some indiscriminate touch-tone brings down the system would be the kind of thing that experimentation is supposed to find out and then modification and improvement is done to eliminate those shortcomings.

>You're demanding that Jim hand the keys to his Porsche to anyone who comes
>along and asks. Are you prepared to buy the machine from him? If not, then ho
>dare you tell him how to run it?

>

>>Just turn your repeater off, that is the only thing you
>>do own and control.

>

>Letting someone who doesn't like me prevent me from using my repeater -
>something that has happened regularly in the Houston area - is silly and
>wrong, but it's exactly what you're advocating: by your standards, someone ho
>doesn't like Jim merely needs to appear on his repeater, thus forcing him to
>either let the guy use it or deprive himself of it.

No, if the access process is sophisticated and secure enough then no one but those "authorized" by Jim will be able to use the repeater. If Jim has no access control (or only a simple PL) then he can't expect that others aren't likely to just key up and use the repeater. Under those circumstances, Jim's only recourse, turn off the repeater or change the access process.

Another point, why is the presumption here that the only possible situation is one in which "someone that doesn't like Jim" is deliberately trying to prevent Jim from using his repeater? I just don't like the concept of private repeaters in general because there's only a finite amount of support, limited to the area I live in, which I can "donate to" to sustain repeater operations. My travels (vacation/business/etc.) with which I usually bring an HT should not mean I need to lay out \$\$\$ to participate in the use of other repeaters elsewhere around the country on Amateur Frequencies I am fully licensed to operate on.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #20
